1	
2	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
4	
5	x
6	
7	In the Matter
8	
9	of Case No. 01-B-12974
10	TELIGENT, INC., Debtor.
11	x
12	November 19, 2003
13	United States Custom House One Bowling Green New York, New York 10004
14	New fork, New fork 10004
15	Hearing re motion to partially vacate an order authorize the assumption of a certain contract
16	with Cigna Healthcare; hearing re 9019 motion
17	to approve settlement with Red Cross and Norlight
18	B E F O R E:
19	HON. STUART M. BERNSTEIN,
20	Chief Bankruptcy Judge.

21 22 23 24 25 HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769 1 TELIGENT, INC. 2 APPEARANCES: 3 KIRKLAND & ELLIS 4 Attorneys for Debtor 5 200 East Randolph Drive Chicago, Illinois 60601 6

2

ANUP SATHY, ESQ., BY: 7 of Counsel 8 9 SAVAGE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 10 Attorneys for Unsecured Claims Estate Rep. 56 Lafayette Avenue 11 White Plains, New York 10603 12 DENISE SAVAGE, ESQ. BY:

14	
15	SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT, LLP
16	Attorneys for J.P. Morgan Chase 425 Lexington Avenue
17	New York, New York 10017
18	BY: ROBERT H. TRUST, ESQ., of Counsel
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769
1	TELIGENT, INC.
2	APPEARANCES (Continued):
3	
4	TOGUT SEGAL & SEGAL, LLP Attorneys for Cigna Healthcare
5	One Penn Plaza

New York, New York 10119

NEIL BERGER, ESQ.

3

BY:

7	of Counsel
8	ANTO
9	-AND-
10	COMMOLIN DONE LODGE C HITTER LID
11	CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP Attorneys for Cigna Healthcare 1007 North Orange Street
12	Wilmington, Delaware 19899
13	BY: JEFFREY C. WISLER, ESQ., of Counsel
14	OI Counsel
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 TELIGENT, INC. 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 4 THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. 5 Savage. I have read all the papers. 6 MS. SAVAGE: Pardon me? 7 THE COURT: I have read all the papers. Go ahead. 8 9 MS. SAVAGE: Which matter would you like me to go forward with first, the 10 11 motion to vacate? 12 THE COURT: Go forward with the 13 settlement. There is only actually two 14 outstanding. I have signed the other four. 15 I just wanted a supplemental affidavit. 16 I have not seen the MS. SAVAGE: 17 order entered. I am not getting electronic 18 notice. I have notified the clerk's office. 19 THE COURT: Yes. They enter 20 the order anyway. 21 MS. SAVAGE: Thank you, Your

In that case we are only dealing with

Honor.

- 23 American Red Cross and Norlight
- 24 Telecommunications.
- THE COURT: Right.

5

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 MS. SAVAGE: In light of Your
- 3 Honor's statement at the last hearing on the
- 4 other four settlement motions which are Iona
- 5 Technical, Dell Receivable and Output
- 6 Technologies and C3 Communications, I felt it
- 7 wise to file supplemental papers on the
- 8 American Red Cross and the Norlight
- 9 Telecommunications motion that had already
- 10 been filed under bankruptcy Rule 9019.
- 11 And what I did, Your Honor, is I
- 12 have provided information regarding new value
- 13 analysis and other information.
- 14 THE COURT: Yes, in the future I
- 15 don't need that kind of detail. I just want

- 16 to know whether you have looked at the
- 17 payments, and by the way a lot of these look
- 18 like checks that bounced, so the payments are
- 19 identical so the analysis -- I just want to
- 20 know that you have considered these and you
- 21 have examined the rank and range is 30 to \$60
- 22 million which is more or less what the Debtor
- 23 was doing at the particular time. That is
- 24 all.
- MS. SAVAGE: Okay, Your Honor.

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 THE COURT: I don't want to try
- 3 the case. I just want to make sure you
- 4 considered the issue because what I got from
- 5 you, basically, we entered into good faith
- 6 negotiations and we decided to settle for X
- 7 amount of dollars because it saves time and
- 8 expense. That is true of every --

- 9 MS. SAVAGE: That is fine, Your
- 10 Honor. I understand that, and I have no
- 11 problem filing whatever information you need
- 12 to in order to make an informed decision.
- Would you like me to make an
- 14 offer of proof on American Red Cross and
- 15 Norlight?
- 16 THE COURT: Yes, what is the
- 17 amount of debt? And then I understand checks
- 18 never cleared and it is actually less than you
- 19 sought originally.
- MS. SAVAGE: It was not that
- 21 they didn't clear. They were actually voided
- 22 by the Debtor, so they were never negotiated.
- 23 With American Red Cross, we originally sued
- 24 for in excess of \$375,000. Thereafter, we
- 25 found out that a check for approximately

7

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 \$350,000 had been voided. So the actual
- 3 total amount of the transfer was \$25,212.
- 4 THE COURT: What is the
- 5 settlement for?
- 6 MS. SAVAGE: The settlement is
- 7 70 percent of that amount --
- THE COURT: That is approved.
- 9 What is the next one?
- 10 MS. SAVAGE: The next one is
- 11 Norlight. Norlight Telecommunications is a
- 12 little bit unusual. It is a utility
- 13 company. It turns out that some of the
- 14 payments made in the 90-day period were
- 15 advance payments for what turned out to be
- 16 postpetition use of utilities.
- 17 Your Honor entered a utilities
- 18 order relating to the payment of utility
- 19 bills, so accordingly I could attempt to
- 20 recover the funds that were paid prepetition
- 21 for the postpetition use of utilities because
- 22 Teligent was entitled to pay postpetition by
- an order entered by this Court in one of the

- 24 first day orders. So, accordingly, I walk
- 25 away from that portion of the claim.

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 Additionally --
- 3 THE COURT: So what is the real
- 4 amount or portion?
- 5 MS. SAVAGE: The real amount
- 6 transferred was \$73,000, but out of that
- 7 amount there were two advanced payments that
- 8 totaled in excess of \$25,000. So ultimately
- 9 I am recovering \$30,000 of \$49,000 that was a
- 10 true preferential payment as opposed to an
- 11 advance payment.
- 12 THE COURT: Why the \$19,000
- 13 haircut?
- MS. SAVAGE: Because \$19,000 of
- 15 the funds paid were not a preferential
- 16 transfer. They were an advance payment for

18 THE COURT: I thought you said

- 19 it was 73, but 25 plus was an advance payment,
- 20 right.
- MS. SAVAGE: Well, it turns out
- 22 also Norlight got a void check, so that was
- 23 edited out of the original claim we filed.
- 24 Furthermore, there was so much doubling of the
- 25 transfers on the analysis that was given to us

HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 by Teligent. So ultimately we --
- 3 THE COURT: After you eliminate
- 4 the Debtor's errors and you eliminate the
- 5 advance payments, what is left?
- 6 MS. SAVAGE: The true transfer
- 7 was \$49,000. That was truly preferential.
- 8 THE COURT: You are settling
- 9 that for 30?

- MS. SAVAGE: Yes.
- 11 THE COURT: Why are you are
- 12 giving up the 19?
- MS. SAVAGE: Because they have a
- 14 very strong ordinary course defense.
- THE COURT: What was the range
- 16 of --
- 17 MS. SAVAGE: If I could just
- 18 refer back to my notes, Your Honor. I
- 19 apologize, Your Honor, for the number of
- 20 paragraphs you have to go through given the
- 21 other four settlements that are encompassed in
- 22 here.
- THE COURT: Okay.
- MS. SAVAGE: There was a
- 25 subsequent new value of \$49,941. The

1 TELIGENT, INC.

2 transfers that were made, the new value

- 3 encompassed the fact there was the providing
- 4 of utilities going forward prior to the
- 5 filing. Furthermore, during the preference
- 6 period the average transfer was made 43.7 days
- 7 from the advance with a mode of 42 days and a
- 8 standard deviation of 26.100 days.
- 9 THE COURT: You could submit
- 10 orders on that.
- 11 MS. SAVAGE: Yes. I have the
- 12 order with me.
- 13 THE COURT: You have to take out
- 14 the others.
- MS. SAVAGE: I do them
- 16 separately.
- 17 THE COURT: Just give me the two
- 18 of them.
- MS. SAVAGE: May I approach,
- 20 Your Honor?
- 21 THE COURT: Yes. I need
- 22 separate orders dismissing these adversaries.
- 23 Okay?
- MS. SAVAGE: Yes, Your Honor.
- 25 We will be filing, actually probably by

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 Friday, a whole bunch of other stips and an
- 3 omnibus order encompasses these and dismisses
- 4 all the cases.
- 5 THE COURT: Okay. Move on to
- 6 your motion.
- 7 MS. SAVAGE: Okay. As this
- 8 Court knows, we have a motion to vacate an
- 9 order assuming an insurance policy by and
- 10 among the Teligent Debtors and Cigna
- 11 Healthcare. What basically transpired was we
- 12 were unaware their lease was assumed. We had
- 13 filed the adversary proceeding against Cigna's
- 14 excess of \$18 million. We discovered since
- 15 that filing some of the numbers were doubled
- 16 an tripled again. So the real claim is a
- 17 little in excess of \$5 million.
- When we were told by Cigna's

- 19 counsel about the assumption, we notified
- 20 Cigna that we intend to make a motion to
- 21 vacate the assumption order, for the reasons
- 22 that I will set forth on the record
- 23 momentarily. In turn, Cigna filed their
- 24 motion to dismiss by Your Honor's September
- 25 30th deadline, I think it was under the

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 scheduling order and we thereafter filed the
- 3 new motion to vacate.
- 4 Since filing the motion to vacate
- 5 we have obviously received objections from
- 6 reorganized Teligent and from Cigna. And one
- 7 of the things we discovered from reorganized
- 8 Teligent's discovery and from the affidavit of
- 9 Lou Duma (phonetic) attached to reorganized
- 10 Teligent's objection, it turns out that the
- 11 original policy that the representatives sued

- 12 under with respect to the claim in the
- 13 adversary proceeding was actually terminated
- 14 prior to the assumption motion.
- 15 THE COURT: So should I just
- 16 deny your motion as moot?
- 17 MS. SAVAGE: That is where I am
- 18 going with this, Your Honor. So what I did I
- 19 contacted Lou Duma and I have spoken with
- 20 Amerada Electric (phonetic) and asked them
- 21 about the sequence of events that occurred
- 22 with respect to the renewal of the initial
- 23 policy.
- 24 And as Your Honor will see and
- 25 you have seen these papers and you have seen

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 in my reply it appears that the initial policy
- 3 because it expired and because under both
- 4 Virginia law, Delaware law, Third Circuit law,

- 5 the Bankruptcy Court's decision in the Eastern
- 6 District of Virginia and also in Delaware that
- 7 the renewal of an insurance policy constitutes
- 8 a whole new contract.
- 9 THE COURT: How was this raised
- 10 though in the motion or the answer in the
- 11 adversary?
- MS. SAVAGE: We have until this
- 13 Friday.
- 14 THE COURT: No. What is the
- 15 theory by which the assumption order justifies
- 16 the dismissal of the action?
- 17 MS. SAVAGE: Well, do you want
- 18 the explanation of Cigna's theory or would you
- 19 like them to state it because it is their
- 20 motion?
- 21 THE COURT: Tell me.
- MS. SAVAGE: Their theory is,
- 23 if the contract that is at issue was
- 24 assumed --
- 25 THE COURT: There can't be a

14

1 TELIGENT, INC. 2 preference. 3 MS. SAVAGE: There can't be a 4 preference. 5 THE COURT: Why don't you make a motion to strike the defense if you are saying it is a different contract? 7 8 MS. SAVAGE: That is what 9 happened because they filed their motion to dismiss first, and I can't indirectly or 10 11 collaterally attached the assumption order in 12 the adversary proceeding. 13 THE COURT: I thought a direct 14 attack would be an appeal from the order assuming the contract. 15 16 MS. SAVAGE: Yes. Had we 17 known about it at the time and had Cigna's contract actually been discussed in the 18

motion.

- THE COURT: The Debtor knew
- 21 about it at the time and you are the
- 22 successor.
- MS. SAVAGE: Pardon me?
- 24 THE COURT: The Debtor knew
- 25 about it and you are the successor of the

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 Debtor.
- 3 MS. SAVAGE: No. It is
- 4 reorganized Teligent that is the successor to
- 5 the Debtor.
- 6 THE COURT: No. The Debtor's
- 7 rights were split in two. Certain interests
- 8 were given to you, the unsecured claims and
- 9 the reorganized includes that you could all
- 10 sue on the rights given to you.
- 11 MS. SAVAGE: I understand that,
- 12 Your Honor. One of the rights is to be able

- 13 to pursue claims on behalf of the estate, and
- 14 I differ from your --
- THE COURT: Whatever rights you
- 16 get, you are still the successor of the
- 17 Debtor.
- 18 MS. SAVAGE: That is not
- 19 necessarily the case. I have a long section
- 20 dedicated in my reply to this issue of
- 21 standing and as to whether or not the Debtor
- 22 is the successor. And I know Cigna is
- 23 relying --
- 24 THE COURT: Let's not -- I don't
- 25 think I have a question that to the extent

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 this assumption order impairs your ability to
- 3 attack or recover, you may be able to make an
- 4 argument that it should be vacated.
- 5 What I question is your walking

- 6 away from baggage the Debtor would carry if
- 7 the Debtor made that motion.
- 8 MS. SAVAGE: What baggage would
- 9 that be?
- 10 THE COURT: Recently you had
- 11 knowledge of and you participated in procuring
- 12 the order and you are estopped from now
- 13 seeking to vacate that from an order you are
- 14 seeking or some other similar theory.
- MS. SAVAGE: The problem is I
- 16 have read the case and decided with respect to
- 17 analyzing what a representative means under
- 18 1123 (b)(3) --
- 19 THE COURT: There is no question
- 20 that you are bringing the estate's claims,
- 21 that is all you have to bring. It comes with
- 22 all the warts and barnacles attached to that
- 23 estate claim and I know we have had had these
- 24 discussions in other contexts. And I don't
- 25 see how to avoid that because the extension of

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 that your theory, I don't know which papers
- 3 said the extension of the theory is that you
- 4 could attack every order that I sign in the
- 5 case. I won't do the whole case over unless
- 6 you are telling me I have to do it over
- 7 because maybe it will put a little more money
- 8 into the estate --
- 9 MS. SAVAGE: Here is my question
- 10 then and by the way of example --
- 11 THE COURT: Isn't that what you
- 12 are really saying, isn't the underpinning of
- 13 your theory, but since a preference claim, a
- 14 successful preference claim will put money
- into the estate, any order I entered into
- 16 this case which would act as a defense to that
- 17 preference claim should be vacated?
- 18 MS. SAVAGE: No. I don't
- 19 think that that is the logical end to that
- 20 argument.
- 21 THE COURT: Tell me where I draw

- 22 the line. I want to know that, if that is a
- 23 unique situation or one of a thousand orders I
- 24 entered.
- MS. SAVAGE: I think it is a

18

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 unique situation and I will explain why.
- First of all, we went through the
- 4 docket prior to the expiration of the statute
- 5 of limitations and we took off every
- 6 settlement agreement that was entered into
- 7 with anyone on the docket and we examined to
- 8 see if that settlement agreement contained
- 9 general releases and most of settlement
- 10 agreements did contain general releases. And
- 11 not only that there was a very strong analysis
- 12 of the underlying claims that were involved
- 13 and what was being waived because I also
- 14 looked at the corresponding motion papers in

14 Tooked at the corresponding motion papers in

- 15 conjunction with the orders that Your Honor 16 entered on other types of settlements, not obviously avoidance claims or settlement in 17 18 the case. 19 My statute of limitations has 20 expired to sue all these people who are 21 entered into those settlement agreements. Ιt 22 is gone because I didn't file the motions 23 because I evaluated the underlying motions and
- 24 the orders entered by this Court to make sure

or certain I would not be wholly precluded,

HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769

nobbon Kill oktilike a viblo, like. I ood 510 1705

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 and that is that.
- 3 As far as assumption motions are
- 4 concerned, 99.9 percent of the leases assumed
- 5 in this case are customers. We are not suing
- 6 customers, we have nothing to do with that.
- 7 Those are customer contracts and we won't be

19

- 8 doing anything with them.
- 9 As far as other assumptions are
- 10 concerned --
- 11 THE COURT: Are you getting that
- 12 because this is an insurance company that is
- 13 the --
- MS. SAVAGE: No. Well, what I
- 15 was going to say is the other motions that
- 16 were filed either other companies we have
- 17 settled with them that we have determined that
- 18 they --
- 19 THE COURT: No, forget about
- 20 settlements because you sued those people and
- 21 I kind of decided if they didn't decide it.
- 22 Tell me what makes this different from any
- 23 other assumption order.
- MS. SAVAGE: What makes this
- 25 different, with respect to the Cigna

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 Healthcare contract, it didn't mention the
- 3 Cigna Healthcare contract or the nature of the
- 4 contract or the underlying business
- 5 justification to assume the contract. The
- 6 motion to assume the Cigna contract only
- 7 specifically dealt with license agreements
- 8 associated with leases, site leases, things of
- 9 that nature. The word healthcare didn't come
- 10 up in the decision.
- 11 The discussion of whether or not
- 12 they could have obtained alternative
- 13 healthcare coverage was never mentioned.
- 14 The nature of the agreements was not even
- 15 mentioned in the motion. It was tossed in
- 16 there perhaps as an afterthought just to
- 17 toss it into what became the lease assumption
- 18 motion that had to be filed prior to
- 19 confirmation.
- 20 THE COURT: I understand if
- 21 someone had appealed that order they could
- 22 arguably say there was no factual basis to

- 23 support the application of the business
- 24 judgment rule. But this is not an appeal
- 25 from the order.

21

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- What you are essentially saying
- 3 is the circumstances you have described are so
- 4 extraordinary. You haven't said the Debtor
- 5 was not entitled to the protection of the
- 6 business judgment rule or anyone breached it
- 7 or anything like that. That is really what
- 8 the bottom line is, they didn't analyze
- 9 to the effect of this preference claim or
- 10 giving up this preference claim when they went
- 11 through the assumption order. But the
- 12 business judgment law protects them against
- 13 negligence.
- MS. SAVAGE: It doesn't protect
- 15 them retroactively. They are trying to

- 17 after they had a requirement to set it forth
- 18 in the original motion.
- 19 THE COURT: But they didn't set
- 20 it forth, as I said. But can you come back
- 21 under Rule 60 a year later and say this is an
- 22 extraordinary circumstance because I granted
- 23 the motion but there wasn't a factual basis
- 24 for granting it which is what you are saying
- 25 but that sounds to me like an appeal. You

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 think you are using Rule 60 as a substitute
- 3 for an appeal.
- 4 MS. SAVAGE: With the exception
- 5 of the committee or the largest 20 or 30
- 6 creditors in this estate and the lenders no
- 7 other unsecured creditors were served with
- 8 this motion at the time. So it is not like

- 9 the unsecured --
- 10 THE COURT: The committee was
- 11 served?
- MS. SAVAGE: Yes, and the
- 13 committee is exactly -- the committee had
- 14 agreed to support the plan in exchange for the
- 15 transfer of these preference claims, including
- 16 the Cigna claim. The Cigna claim was never
- 17 disclosed as being waived as a result of the
- 18 assumption --
- 19 THE COURT: That is not what the
- 20 plan says.
- MS. SAVAGE: Pardon me?
- THE COURT: The plan says you
- 23 are to get the Chapter 7 avoidance claims that
- 24 were not previously released or waived or
- 25 something like that. You want me to redo

23

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 this whole bankruptcy and that is the problem
- 3 I have with this whole motion.
- 4 MS. SAVAGE: I am not looking to
- 5 redo the bankruptcy. I see the Maxwell case
- 6 by Judge Brozman where the creditors committee
- 7 collaterally attacked a settlement agreement
- 8 which they were served with notice of but
- 9 because the creditors committee --
- 10 THE COURT: This is not a
- 11 settlement agreement, it is a little
- 12 different.
- MS. SAVAGE: But it has the same
- 14 effect and, Your Honor, I have cited a number
- of cases, Second Circuit cases. The Supreme
- 16 Court Court case which talks about Rule 60,
- 17 (b)(6) and contemplates this Court taking into
- 18 account errors or orders being entered in
- 19 error.
- 20 THE COURT: Can I ask you a
- 21 different question?
- MS. SAVAGE: Yes.
- THE COURT: What is the
- 24 practical effect of vacating an assumption

25 order?

HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769

24

1 TELIGENT, INC. 2 It is only a MS. SAVAGE: partial vacating and only with respect to 3 Cigna and it preserves the avoidance action. 4 5 THE COURT: What about the 6 people who received medical benefits since 7 the assumption order? Won't they now have to 8 pay for the medical services they have 9 received? 10 MS. SAVAGE: The answer --11 THE COURT: This is coverage. 12 MS. SAVAGE: The answer to that 13 is -- and this goes back --14 THE COURT: And should I take 15 that into account under Rule 60(b). 16 MS. SAVAGE: Answer --

THE COURT:

Answer that question

- 18 first.
- MS. SAVAGE: I am trying to,
- 20 Your Honor.
- 21 THE COURT: It is a yes-or-no
- 22 answer. That is it.
- MS. SAVAGE: It can't possibly
- 24 be a yes-or-no answer.
- THE COURT: Okay.

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 MS. SAVAGE: The answer is
- 3 twofold. The first is it goes back to my
- 4 first argument which is I don't think that the
- 5 contract that was assumed was even the
- 6 contract that was the subject of the adversary
- 7 proceeding.
- 8 THE COURT: What if I just deny
- 9 this motion because I wouldn't reach that
- 10 issue, I wouldn't even think about this

- 11 issue until there is a determination that
- 12 the assumption order has any relevance.
- MS. SAVAGE: If Your Honor wants
- 14 to dismiss this motion without prejudice
- 15 because there is a question as to whether it
- 16 is just issuable because of this other primary
- 17 issue that was discovered on the basis of the
- 18 information that I got from Teligent after we
- 19 filed this motion, I have no problem with
- 20 that.
- 21 THE COURT: It sounds to me like
- 22 an initial argument, your initial responses
- 23 either in opposition to their motion,
- 24 essentially said it may have been a factual
- 25 issue. I don't know. That would require a

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 trial. I just don't know.
- MS. SAVAGE: I am prepared to

- 4 proceed with an evidentiary hearing today.
- 5 THE COURT: Well, I know --
- 6 MS. SAVAGE: On the primary
- 7 issue.
- 8 THE COURT: I am not even sure
- 9 this is the appropriate context. You keep on
- 10 making these general motions in the adversary
- 11 proceeding that is pending which comes up.
- MS. SAVAGE: I didn't make the
- 13 first general motion. The lenders actually
- 14 did that. I responded to it.
- 15 THE COURT: That is true. What
- 16 is happening with that?
- 17 MS. SAVAGE: I have been a
- 18 settlement agreement and I have been so busy
- 19 with other contested matters in this case, but
- 20 we have a settlement agreement circulating.
- 21 THE COURT: As I understand it,
- 22 you are arguing in the first instance they
- 23 assumed a different contract than the one that
- is affected by the preference.
- MS. SAVAGE: That appears to be

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 the case, Your Honor.
- 3 THE COURT: All right.
- 4 MR. SATHY: Good morning, Your
- 5 Honor. Anup Sathy, from the law firm of
- 6 Kirkland & Ellis, on behalf of the reorganized
- 7 Teligent.
- 8 We are looking for a ruling on
- 9 the motion to vacate today. We think there
- 10 are three vital reasons why.
- 11 First is the existence of the
- 12 motion having undue harm on the employees of
- 13 Teligent. These are employees that are
- 14 fairly sophisticated.
- THE COURT: You never answered
- 16 my question, Ms. Savage. So what happens if I
- 17 vacate? Let's say that it is the same
- 18 contract.

19 MS. SAVAGE: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Let's say it is the 21 same contract and I vacate, do these people 22 now have to pay? 23 Are these people who don't have 24 medical coverage and have to pay for whatever 25 medical benefits they got from this previously HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 assumed and rejected contract?
- 3 MS. SAVAGE: No, I don't think
- 4 that has to happen.
- 5 THE COURT: Why?
- 6 MS. SAVAGE: Because there is
- 7 the principle of quantum meriut. Cigna under
- 8 his --
- 9 THE COURT: Quantum meriut, they
- 10 get service so they have to pay it.
- 11 MS. SAVAGE: But the payments

- 12 have been made prospectively. It doesn't
- 13 negate the fact that Cigna probably would have
- 14 continued the contract anyway. There is no
- 15 guarantee that this contract will continue in
- 16 perpetuity because Cigna has the absolute
- 17 right to cancel this contract.
- 18 THE COURT: It is a different
- 19 thing to sign on a going forward basis there
- is no coverage and you buy your own medical
- 21 coverage, which happens to all of us at one
- 22 time or another in different degrees, but
- 23 saying that the coverage you think you had and
- 24 you never bothered to get it, if someone went
- 25 to the hospital and ran up a \$100,000 medical

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 bill, now you are saying you have to pay it.
- 3 If you have \$4 million it is okay.
- 4 MS. SAVAGE: This contract was

- 5 subject to renewal again, at about the time
- 6 the assumption motion was ruled on. It was
- 7 not ruled on October 18. There was --
- 8 MR. SATHY: Judge, the way the
- 9 plan worked and this is what happened, we
- 10 actually filed the motion just prior to
- 11 confirmation an the plan provided that if
- 12 there was a pending motion that motion would
- 13 carry. That is what the plan provided.
- 14 THE COURT: I am not sure what
- 15 the code says.
- MS. SAVAGE: But even within the
- one month period after the filing there was a
- 18 subsequent renewal of this contract yet
- 19 again. So I question whether the contract
- 20 that has continued in perpetuity is the same
- 21 contract that was even actually subject to
- 22 assumption of the order because my
- 23 understanding in speaking with Ms. Duma,
- 24 examining the --
- 25 THE COURT: Is that an issue I

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 could decide as a matter of law whether it was
- 3 the same contract?
- 4 MR. SATHY: It is not. And I
- 5 am not even sure why I am here. This is a
- 6 dispute --
- 7 THE COURT: Don't ask me.
- 8 MR. SATHY: This is a dispute
- 9 between Cigna, and the estate claims
- 10 representative. If she wants to allege it is
- 11 a separate --
- 12 THE COURT: Were are you here?
- MR. SATHY: Because she is
- 14 moving to vacate an order that is effective on
- 15 50 employees of Teligent and the remaining 150
- 16 contracts that we have assumed. And, Your
- 17 Honor, this was not a throw-away motion. It
- 18 was very deliberate.
- 19 THE COURT: One of her arguments
- 20 is that there was no factual basis. Whether

- 21 or not it was an appropriate exercise of
- 22 business judgment motion itself doesn't set
- 23 forth a factual basis to assume this
- 24 particular contract.
- 25 She is saying this is an

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 extraordinary circumstance. Maybe you should
- 3 have another trial on whether there is a
- 4 factual basis to assume the contract.
- 5 MR. SATHY: Your Honor, with
- 6 respect to the motion, the motion had a
- 7 121-page exhibit that listed thousands of
- 8 contracts that were assumed. She is right,
- 9 most of contracts were with customers much but
- 10 there were approximately 150 that were with
- 11 individual parties.
- Now I am not aware that an actual
- 13 factual finding was made with respect to each

- 14 one, but we did serve this motion to the
- 15 lenders, to the committee, to the major
- 16 creditors. Everyone knew what these contracts
- 17 were. We did do a high level preference
- 18 analysis, all very unlike what she suggested
- 19 in her papers. And we evaluated what
- 20 possible claims may be --
- 21 THE COURT: But that is not in
- 22 the record. I am not saying if we went
- 23 through this procedure again you couldn't get
- 24 an order permitting the assumption of the
- 25 contract.

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 MR. SATHY: That is where we
- 3 would wind up, Your Honor.
- 4 We filed an affidavit, not
- 5 because we needed to because she made
- 6 statements --

- 7 THE COURT: Should we do it this
- 8 way?
- 9 MS. SAVAGE: What was that, Your
- 10 Honor?
- 11 THE COURT: We will have another
- 12 hearing on whether or not it is an appropriate
- 13 exercise of business judgment to assume this
- 14 contract. There are a lot of competing
- 15 interests.
- I am very concerned the way this
- 17 is going, people who have gotten the benefit
- 18 under this contract will be affected
- 19 regardless of who you think has not gotten
- 20 notice of this.
- MS. SAVAGE: Well, by the same
- token, the thousands of unsecured creditors
- 23 who are going to lose the ability to
- 24 potentially share in a recovery of Cigna also
- 25 didn't get the notice of the assumption of the

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 original motion.
- 3 THE COURT: That one is a
- 4 loser. The committee did.
- 5 MR. SATHY: The way the plan
- 6 works, she was unsecured from the --
- 7 THE COURT: You are a successor
- 8 to the estate. You are not a successor to
- 9 the unsecured creditors.
- MR. SATHY: And when my partner,
- 11 Mr. Klein (phonetic) was sitting in this Court
- 12 and he said that the unsecured creditors will
- 13 not get any recovery, it turned out to be
- 14 true.
- 15 THE COURT: A remarkable
- 16 statement on the first day.
- 17 MR. SATHY: And that was a sense
- 18 of where this company was, and it turned out
- 19 to be true. The only reason why the
- 20 unsecured creditors are entitled to anything
- 21 is because of the settlement that this Court

- 22 approved.
- 23 THE COURT: It is all the
- lender's money anyway.
- MR. SATHY: Absolutely all the

34

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 lenders have had a lien on these causes of
- 3 action anyway. They agreed as part of the
- 4 plan to let a certain part of the cause of
- 5 action go. We wind up here again and again.
- 6 THE COURT: So demand that she
- 7 not make the motion and withdraw it, give her
- 8 the offer and seek the sanctions.
- 9 MR. SATHY: We asked the Court
- 10 to rule on this motion. We have asked
- 11 this Court to rule on this motion, and Your
- 12 Honor --
- 13 THE COURT: Let me take a step
- 14 back. Her argument is, her first argument is

- 15 the contract that was assumed was a different
- 16 contract that generated the preference. That
- doesn't really affect the employees who have
- 18 received benefits.
- 19 My question is, is that something
- 20 that could be decided as a matter of law or
- 21 something that has to be tried because there
- 22 are factual issues?
- MR. SATHY: Your Honor, I
- 24 believe that is a factual issue. That is not
- 25 a question of law. We have our opinion as to

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 whether or not there was one contract. We
- 3 have shared information with Ms. Savage.
- 4 THE COURT: That is a legal
- 5 issue? Do I just read the contracts and the
- 6 cases? What would the evidence show other
- 7 than the contract? That is all I am asking if

- 8 I had a hearing.
- 9 MR. WISLER: Jeffrey Wisler, on
- 10 behalf of Cigna.
- 11 May I address that?
- 12 THE COURT: Yes.
- MR. WISLER: What the evidence
- 14 will show that there was one continuing policy
- 15 from 1998 on. What the evidence will show is
- 16 an agreement that under its express terms did
- 17 not expire. It is terminable and it also
- 18 expressly provides for rate renewals. It's
- 19 what the movant's papers suggest.
- 20 THE COURT: Is there a term in
- 21 the contract?
- MR. WISLER: No, there is an
- 23 anniversary date in the contract and at the
- 24 anniversary date there is a provision for a
- 25 rate renewal, the customer Teligent if they

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 don't like the new rates may cancel, Cigna may
- 3 not. Cigna may change the rates --
- 4 THE COURT: And Ms. Savage is
- 5 saying under the case law, as I understand
- 6 your argument, that makes it a separate
- 7 contract for assumption and assignment
- 8 purposes. Right?
- 9 MS. SAVAGE: That is correct,
- 10 Your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: You agree that is
- 12 what the contract says.
- 13 All I am saying is that it sounds
- 14 like a legal issue which I could resolve.
- 15 In other words, if I had a hearing I would
- 16 read -- you put in the contract, I would read
- 17 it. There is no testimony. I assume the
- 18 contract is clear and then I would read her
- 19 case and make a decision. That is all I am
- 20 suggesting.
- 21 MR. WISLER: That is possible,
- 22 Your Honor. I agree with Mr. Sathy that we
- 23 need a decision now. What we don't want is to

- 24 have continuing motions by the moving party.
- 25 That is a new argument.

37

THE COURT: I don't know how I

TELIGENT, INC.

- 3 could vacate an order without notice to
- 4 employees.

- 5 MR. WISLER: What I am saying,
- 6 Your Honor, this issue may come up again and
- 7 again. In Superior (phonetic), the motion to
- 8 vacate the issue was this tangential issue,
- 9 Judge,, it was not an executory contract. It
- 10 could never have been assumed. You don't
- 11 address it.
- 12 It was a motion to assume the
- 13 contract, the contract was assumed, there is a
- 14 reliance, there is prejudice and you can't go
- 15 back on them.
- 16 THE COURT: She is saying it is

- 18 saying it is the same contract, but she is
- 19 saying it is a different contract.
- 20 MR. WISLER: When faced with
- 21 these types of issues before, the courts in
- 22 Superior Court and Feldman said I am not even
- 23 getting to the issue of whether or it not it
- 24 is a true lease or an executory contract. It
- 25 was assumed. The Debtor's conduct is imputed

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 to the trustee or the successor or whatever.
- 3 THE COURT: I don't think I have
- 4 any question on that one.
- 5 MR. WISLER: So I don't have any
- 6 question on it either, Your Honor. Let me
- 7 give you an example. One of the defenses
- 8 that we discussed in our memorandum is the
- 9 fact that all prepetition -- if there were any

- 10 prepetition payments due to Cigna
- 11 postpetition, they are authorized to be paid
- 12 under the original employee benefits order.
- 13 That is an absolute defense. So if we don't
- 14 address the issue of standing and estoppel
- 15 now, we will face this again later.
- 16 THE COURT: At the beginning of
- 17 this presentation when we were talking about
- 18 settlement you said there was an existing
- 19 order authorizing payments, and since the
- 20 Court had authorized payments I can't
- 21 challenge it.
- What he is really saying if these
- 23 had not been paid within the 90 days before
- the filing of petition, it would have been
- 25 paid pursuant to that order.

1 TELIGENT, INC.

MS. SAVAGE: I don't know. I

- 3 haven't seen the order. It has not been
- 4 raised in its papers.
- 5 MR. WISLER: It absolutely
- 6 was.
- 7 MS. SAVAGE: In which, their
- 8 original motion?
- 9 MR. WISLER: Yes, Your Honor, it
- 10 was --
- 11 THE COURT: In motion and in
- 12 their response?
- MR. WISLER: In the response.
- MS. SAVAGE: In your objection
- 15 to those papers. I'm sorry, I am thinking of
- 16 the motion to dismiss. I was sure we are on
- 17 same page.
- 18 MR. WISLER: I am not asking
- 19 Your Honor to rule. This is another instance
- 20 we will have to come back again and again and
- 21 maybe then again if we don't resolve the
- 22 issues of equitable estoppel and standing at
- 23 this point.
- What Mr. Sathy is pointing out is

25 he has to keep coming back because those types

HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769

40

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 of issues affect him and a lot of other
- 3 people, not just the two parties to the
- 4 litigation.
- 5 MR. SATHY: And, Your Honor,
- 6 just from reorganized Teligent's perspective,
- 7 the concern is if he starts down this road
- 8 there is no end because there is just --
- 9 THE COURT: I think you are
- 10 right on that.
- 11 MR. SATHY: All she has is a
- 12 potential preference claim. If Your Honor
- 13 recalls we had dozens and dozens of
- 14 stipulations with Verizon. And I see counsel
- 15 for Verizon here, and we waived claims against
- 16 Verizon and she did not sue them because she
- 17 is bound by the plan, and she only gets what

- 18 we given to her and that was the gift. If
- 19 she is arguing the gift was too small she
- 20 should have been there at the table. She
- 21 wasn't. The committee was.
- 22 THE COURT: I hear you. What I
- 23 would like you to supplement, I would like to
- 24 know the amount of claims that were paid for
- 25 post assumption treatment under policy. I

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 want to know the effect this will have on
- 3 people, on the employees and you put in some
- 4 proof on that. You could put in any response
- 5 to that if you want.
- 6 MS. SAVAGE: I have to evaluate
- 7 that order, that postpetition order
- 8 authorizing prepetition benefit payments.
- 9 THE COURT: So you could
- 10 supplement your motion.

11 MS. SAVAGE: No. Well, 12 potentially, but not in terms of trying it 13 vacate it, but in terms of most of the orders 14 you had a ceiling dollar amount, how much 15 could be spent to pay the prepetition and 16 there had been a register maintained by Ernst 17 & Young demonstrating who was paid pursuant to 18 The question is could they have been that. 19 paid in any event given the ceiling on order. 20 21 MR. WISLER: And in the cases we 22 cite it doesn't matter. For instance, in the 23 order Your Honor entered, you didn't direct 24 payment, you authorized payment. I don't

HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769

recall a payment, but it is irrelevant because

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 nothing was paid under it.
- 3 THE COURT: But you would have

- 4 paid --
- 5 MR. WISLER: It is a reliance.
- 6 It is a Court approval of what was paid
- 7 prepetition.
- 8 THE COURT: She saying it if
- 9 there is a limitation, in other words if you
- 10 were authorized less than the \$4 million, then
- 11 arguably that portion would be preference.
- 12 You could provide me with a copy of the order
- 13 also because it is not so easy to find.
- MR. WISLER: I have one with me.
- 15 THE COURT: But I would like an
- 16 affidavit as to the claims history and in
- 17 essence what the effect would be in vacating
- 18 the order or potential effect since people
- 19 have presumably gotten medical benefits. Is
- 20 that something that is difficult to do?
- MR. SATHY: I am not sure --
- 22 THE COURT: Because I see
- 23 numbers bandied about in the reply, but there
- 24 is no evidentiary basis.
- MR. SATHY: I suspect we will be

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 able to do that. My opinion is it is not
- 3 relevant. She has to meet the burden of
- 4 extraordinary circumstances. The effect on
- 5 the other party is not a relevant
- 6 consideration for determining whether she is
- 7 she satisfied, 60(b)(6). It is her burden.
- 8 The effect on the other period of time it is a
- 9 relevant factor, but we don't need to show
- 10 anything.
- 11 THE COURT: I would like to know
- 12 if there were going to be people hanging out
- there who will suddenly be liable for medical
- 14 benefits that they thought would be covered by
- 15 a policy and are not even parties to this
- 16 motion.
- When can you submit that? I have
- 18 no idea what is involved in it.
- 19 There are statements in the

- 20 papers regarding the thousands an thousands of
- 21 claims that are being paid. They have to
- 22 come from somewhere. Where did this come
- 23 from.
- MR. WISLER: The statements in
- 25 the papers said thousands of claims processed

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 on an annual basis. I don't think we
- 3 estimated a dollar amount.
- 4 THE COURT: I think someone had
- 5 a statement and you are telling me you don't
- 6 know it.
- 7 MR. WISLER: I am not saying you
- 8 can't know it. I can't tell you it is easy
- 9 and I can tell you, having represented Cigna
- 10 for some time, that it is going to be a
- 11 difficult target, but an estimate is certainly
- 12 doable.

13 THE COURT: You say thousands of claims of Teligent employees and their 14 dependents have been processed and paid by 15 16 Cigna since the entry of the assumption 17 order. So that must have been from 18 somewhere. 19 MR. WISLER: That is what I am telling you, Your Honor. We did not estimate 20 21 a dollar amount. 22 THE COURT: You have to have 23 some history of what the average claim is or 24 something like that. 25 MR. WISLER: Yes, Your Honor.

HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769

45

1 TELIGENT, INC.

2 THE COURT: I just want to

3 know.

4 MS. SAVAGE: If I also may point

5 out. One of the reasons in that that Ms.

- 6 Mount (phonetic) month talked that the Cigna
- 7 policy was renewed after the insurance rate
- 8 was raised back in, I think it was February of
- 9 2002, was because of the burden of this, of so
- 10 many former employees on COBRA.
- 11 The only thing I could say to
- 12 that is that even if the Cigna policy were
- 13 terminated, under the COBRA laws, the people,
- 14 the COBRA people would still have a right to
- 15 pay, to obtain a rate, an individual rate from
- 16 Cigna and continue that coverage.
- 17 THE COURT: I am not going to
- 18 grant any 60(b) motion because you are asking
- 19 me to in the exercise of business judgment.
- MS. SAVAGE: That is not the
- 21 argument.
- 22 THE COURT: Are you saying there
- 23 was not sufficient disclosure of the grounds
- 24 to assume this contract? You could challenge
- 25 that on 60(b), and if you challenge it may be

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 all they have to do is put on their proof and
- 3 that will be the end.
- 4 MS. SAVAGE: The question is not
- 5 whether I could impeach their business
- 6 judgment, which I am not looking to do.
- 7 THE COURT: Sure you are.
- 8 MR. SATHY: That is absolutely
- 9 what she said in her papers.
- 10 THE COURT: That is what you are
- 11 asking me to do.
- MS. SAVAGE: That is not what I
- 13 asked.
- 14 THE COURT: Take a look at it
- 15 again, and consider all these other facts and
- 16 the people on COBRA, it might be a hardship,
- 17 but for the \$4 million I may let them get a
- 18 COBRA policy.
- MS. SAVAGE: No, Your Honor,
- 20 excuse me, in our initial motion, a motion to

- 21 vacate, we knew of no business justification.
- 22 There were no factual statements or findings
- 23 with respect to the assumption in the first
- 24 place. So we didn't sit there and impeach
- 25 any business judgment because there was not

47

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 any business justification offered in the
- 3 first place.
- 4 THE COURT: Do you want to have
- 5 a trial on the appropriateness of the business
- 6 judgment?
- 7 MS. SAVAGE: I want to have a
- 8 hearing on the appropriateness of trying to
- 9 retroactively to argue business judgment when
- 10 it should have been argued at the time of the
- 11 assumption of the order and that is what our
- 12 position is.
- 13 THE COURT: I got it.

14 MR. WISLER: I completely 15 disagree with it. 16 THE COURT: When can you get the 17 information provided? 18 MR. WISLER: I will provide 19 it -- if it is available, Your Honor. And I 20 could provide it --21 THE COURT: Can you provide it, 22 well, next week is Thanksgiving. Can you provide it by the end of the month or let me 23 24 know it is just --25 MS. SAVAGE: Yes, Your Honor.

HUDSON REPORTING & VIDEO, INC. 1-800-310-1769

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 I could either report to you that it is
- 3 impossible overall, which I doubt, or
- 4 impossible in that time frame, or I could
- 5 provide it to the Court.
- 6 THE COURT: Okay. I will

- 7 reserve decision.
- 8 MS. SAVAGE: Can I address the
- 9 procedural posture of the pending motion to
- 10 dismiss, though, because Cigna also made their
- 11 motion to dismiss?
- 12 THE COURT: Right.
- MS. SAVAGE: We are filing, I
- 14 believe actually today our objection to that
- 15 motion to dismiss. We are doing an omnibus
- 16 objection for all the objections that were on
- 17 before Your Honor on January 22. We are
- 18 incorporating by reference our motion and are
- 19 ready to reply here in the main case.
- 20 THE COURT: It would help if you
- 21 put it on Pacer though.
- MS. SAVAGE: I could do it. It
- 23 is not a big deal. Presumably, Cigna will
- have a right to reply now by December 15,
- 25 pursuant to Your Honor's scheduling order to

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 the facts we have set forth and presumably
- 3 annex the order that they are relying on, that
- 4 postpetition first day order.
- 5 THE COURT: That is a real
- 6 simple argument as I understand it. The
- 7 contract is assumed. There is no preference
- 8 and the contract was assumed. And unless the
- 9 order is vacated they have a complete defense,
- 10 a preference action, right?
- MS. SAVAGE: No, not if the
- 12 contract that was assumed is actually not the
- 13 contract that was in place at the time of the
- 14 assumption motion.
- THE COURT: Do I have all the
- 16 contracts so I could read them? Do I have a
- 17 complete record to make that determination on
- 18 that motion?
- MR. WISLER: No.
- 20 MR. SATHY: I suspect you do
- 21 not, Your Honor.
- MR. WISLER: Our point is you

- 23 don't have to decide that to decide the
- 24 motion.
- 25 THE COURT: So I will decide the

50

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 motion based on the existing record, if you
- 3 are satisfied with it. You may not like the
- 4 resolution of it based on this record because
- 5 I don't know how I am going to determine if
- 6 they are the same contract if I can't read the
- 7 contract.
- 8 MR. WISLER: I can provide Your
- 9 Honor with the contracts along with that
- 10 affidavit. I shouldn't say contracts.
- 11 There is only one contract. There are
- 12 multiple policies and I could provide whatever
- 13 Your Honor wants in that regard.
- 14 What I was saying is I don't
- 15 think Your Honor has to consider the multiple

- 16 contract argument for purposes of denying the
- 17 motion to vacate. If Your Honor disagrees I
- 18 respect that, but I will submit what Your
- 19 Honor --
- 20 THE COURT: I have only asked
- 21 for one thing and I will decide the motion
- 22 based on what I have.
- MR. SATHY: One final point. I
- 24 know I have another motion.
- 25 THE COURT: And I have a judges

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 meeting as well.
- 3 MR. SATHY: The reorganized
- 4 Teligent continues to get pulled into these
- 5 matters and it is a financial drain to the
- 6 company.
- 7 THE COURT: So what could I do?
- 8 MR. SATHY: We need a ruling,

- 9 guidance from the Court that what the plan
- 10 says is what it says.
- 11 THE COURT: I think what you
- 12 have to do is, if you think a motion is made
- in bad faith, she is entitled to make a
- 14 motion, I can't say she can't make motions, if
- 15 you think a motion is made in bad faith, you
- 16 insist in accordance with Rule 9011 that she
- 17 withdraw it. You send her a copy of your
- 18 motion for sanctions.
- 19 MR. SATHY: That is our
- 20 procedure.
- 21 THE COURT: If she doesn't
- 22 withdraw it within 21 days, and I agree with
- 23 you that the motion has no basis in law or in
- 24 fact or that it is frivolous, she will have to
- 25 pay out of her pocket, not out of the estate's

52

1 TELIGENT, INC.

- 2 pocket. That is all. But I can't tell her
- 3 she can't make motions. The plan says what
- 4 it says. The question is what it means.
- 5 MR. SATHY: If we need to have a
- 6 hearing on that, that is fine. We think the
- 7 contract issue is a separate issue. If she
- 8 wants to argue it is a separate contract and
- 9 the contract is assumed and as a matter of law
- 10 that doesn't change the claim, She could do
- 11 that within the contract's language. You
- 12 can't enlarge or grant under the plan.
- THE COURT: I agree, but the
- 14 question is what does she have.
- MR. SATHY: It is very clear,
- she has everything unless it was previously
- 17 waived or released.
- 18 THE COURT: I agree that the
- 19 representative has whatever the plan gave the
- 20 representative the right to do. Now, there
- 21 may be some collateral rights. I don't
- 22 know. You are not going to get that kind
- of statement other than the obvious, it is

- 24 the plan, it describes the parameters of
- 25 the representative's powers. It is what

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 it is.
- 3 MS. SAVAGE: If I may, Your
- 4 Honor, we have the Exhibit A and B to our
- 5 reply.
- A is the policy that Teligent
- 7 provided, the Cigna policy. And B is a
- 8 series of e-mails between Cigna, the insurer,
- 9 the insurance broker relating to the renewal
- 10 of the policy. Ms. Duma is in Court today and
- 11 I relied on her affidavit in support of the
- 12 motion.
- 13 THE COURT: I have another
- 14 motion and a meeting today, so let us wrap it
- 15 up.
- MS. SAVAGE: I am. And all

- 17 E-mails were received by Ms. Duma in the
- 18 course of her regular business. I know it is
- 19 attached to her papers.
- MS. SAVAGE: I want to move them
- 21 into evidence.
- 22 THE COURT: This is not an
- 23 evidentiary hearing. If I determine that we
- 24 need an evidentiary hearing, I haven't heard
- 25 them dispute authenticity of the E-mails or

- 1 TELIGENT, INC.
- 2 whatever they are, where they say they come
- 3 from them.
- 4 MS. SAVAGE: That is fine, Your
- 5 Honor.
- 6 MR. BERGER: This will just take
- 7 one minute. I am the local counsel for
- 8 defendant Cigna.
- 9 We received a proposed order

10	approving immediate mediation proceedings. We
11	were never served with the motion. Having
12	seen the way these adversary proceedings and
13	these issues are going, we don't think this is
14	an appropriate matter to
15	THE COURT: Put in opposition
16	you were never served with the motion.
17	Thank you.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

55

1 TELIGENT, INC.

2 CERTIFICATE

3	
4	STATE OF NEW YORK)) ss.:
5	COUNTY OF NEW YORK)
6	
7	I, MINDY ROTHMAN, a Shorthand
8	Reporter and Notary Public within and for
9	the State of New York, do hereby certify:
10	I reported the proceedings in the
11	within-entitled matter and that the within
12	transcript is a true record of such
13	proceedings.
14	I further certify that I am not
15	related, by blood or marriage, to any of
16	the parties in this matter and that I am
17	in no way interested in the outcome of
18	this matter.
19	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
20	set my hand this 21st day of November,
21	2003.
22	
23	
24	MINDY ROTHMAN
25	